



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/752,501	12/29/2000	Kireeti Kompella	Juniper-4 (JNP-0026)	9488
26479	7590	11/03/2005	EXAMINER	
STRAUB & POKOTYLO 620 TINTON AVENUE BLDG. B, 2ND FLOOR TINTON FALLS, NJ 07724			JONES, PRENELL P	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2668	

DATE MAILED: 11/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/752,501	Applicant(s) KOMPELLA, KIREETI	
	Examiner Prenell P. Jones	Art Unit 2668	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 July 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-41, 53-55, 57, 60, 61, 63 and 70-78 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 18, 19, 36, 40, 41, 70 and 72 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-39, 53-55, 57, 63, 71 and 73-78 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) 60 and 61 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. .
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. <u> </u> |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u> </u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: <u> </u> |

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 2-41, 53-55, 57, 60, 61, 63 and 70-78 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 34 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claim reads as "printed matter," such as a "piece of paper." Claim 35 depends on claim 34; therefore, claim 34 is rejected for the same reasons that claim 35 is rejected.

See MPEP § 2105 for patentability of microorganisms and MPEP § 2106 - § 2106.02 for patentability of mathematical algorithms or computer programs.

Decisions have determined the limits of the statutory classes. Examples of subject matter is Printed Matter:

For example, a mere arrangement of printed matter, though seemingly a "manufacture," is rejected as not being within the statutory classes. See *In re Miller*, 418 F.2d 1392, 164 USPQ 46 (CCPA 1969); *Ex parte Gwinn*, 112 USPQ 439 (Bd. App. 1955); and *In re Jones*, 373 F.2d 1007, 153 USPQ 77 (CCPA 1967.)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 2-17, 20-28, 37-39, 63, 71 and 73-78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cao et al in view of Stacey et al and Byrnes.

Regarding claims 2-17, 37-39, 63, 71 and 73-78, Cao discloses (Abstract, Fig. 1, col. 5, line 10 thru col. 7, line 67, a communication system that employs explicit routing protocols between a plurality of LSR (label switched router), explicit routing is a subset of constraint-based routing, whereby explicit route is represented in a label-request message as a list or group of nodes, node selected from group of nodes, constraint-based route is encoded as a series of ER-hops, each node along the path attempts to determine a loop-free path (partial path), (col. 6, line 4 thru col. 7, line 67) "next" router attempt to fulfill constraints if selected node fails, nodes/LSR determines if it is adjacent to abstract node, if a node is not part of the abstract node (a node to which constraint process is delegated) described by a first ER-hop an error message is returned indicating "Bad initial ER-hop and Bad explicit routing TLV" error, router establish a plurality of partially distinct paths, ER-hops are loose hops, if next node is a strict ER-hop, then there is an error and it is represented by a "Bad strict node" error, (col. 8, line 20 thru col. 10, line 41) path parameters include peak rate, committed rate, service granularity, peak rate defines bandwidth, delay variations, area border/boundary router gateway, communication of "downstream lost"

Art Unit: 2668

status message and "upstream lost" status message in detection of broken path. However, Cao is silent on autonomous system and message including a path determination constraint expressed as an executable instruction. In analogous art, Stacey discloses a communication network that supports constraints associated with COPS (common open policy service), wherein the COPS messages are pushed to LSRs where they are used to invoke/execute RSVP message, constraint based routed label switched paths between plurality groups of service nodes via abstract nodes (col. 4, line 15-46), autonomous systems, QoS declared as an constraint with requirements that are associated with the COPS command messages and RSVP messages (col. 5, line 45 thru col. 6, line 37, col. 9, line 20-28), and Byrnes discloses controlling a communication system wherein the architecture contains a plurality of LSRs/nodes and Automatic traffic control computer (ATCC) which utilizes constraints such as QoS, bandwidth and queue monitoring and associated variables as response time, throughput and delay/jitter to generate paths that route traffic in conjunction with (paragraph 0013-0018), ATCC utilizes received messages that include constraints to control and operate network via computer executable instructions (0026-0029, 0035-0038, 0045-0052, 0057, 0065), and ATCC sends messages and NNI messages to establish or modify paths with respect to the execution of constraint instructions, and further constrains include queue type, (0070-0075). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to be motivated to implement the combined teachings of Stacey and Byrnes who teach executing instructions with respect to constraints associated in a message/request with the teachings of Cao for the purpose of further managing, controlling and operating the communication among nodes in a LSR environment as to reduce congestion.

Regarding claims 20-28, as indicated above, Cao discloses (Abstract, Fig. 1, col. 5, line 10 thru col. 7, line 67, a communication system that employs explicit routing protocols between a plurality of LSR (label switched router), explicit routing is a subset of constraint-based routing, whereby explicit route is represented in a label-request message as a list or group of nodes, node selected from group of nodes, constraint-based route is encoded as a series of ER-hops, each node along the path attempts to determine a loop-free path (partial path), (col. 6, line 4 thru col. 7, line 67) "next" router attempt to fulfill constraints if selected node fails, nodes/LSR determines if it is adjacent to abstract node, if a node is not part of the abstract node (a node to which constraint process is delegated) described by a first ER-hop an error message is returned indicating "Bad initial ER-hop and Bad explicit routing TLV" error, router establish a plurality of partially distinct paths, ER-hops are loose hops, if next node is a strict ER-hop, then there is an error and it is represented by a "Bad strict node" error, (col. 8, line 20 thru col. 10, line 41) path parameters include peak rate, committed rate, service granularity, peak rate defines bandwidth, delay variations, area border/boundary router gateway, communication of "downstream lost" status message and "upstream lost" status message in detection of broken path. Cao further discloses (col. 11, line 15-40) that the methods achieved can be implemented using appropriate processor instructions used in combination with software and hardware logic.

2. Claims 29, 30, 31, 33-35 and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goguen et al in view of Chernoff et al.

Regarding claims 29, 30, 31, 33-35 and 57, Goguen discloses an MPLS system that determines the path in the design of traffic flow in a traffic engineering environment, wherein the

Art Unit: 2668

architecture includes nodes communicating between each other, constraint-based routing, constraint-based calculations are utilized in request messages, MPLS commands utilized, bandwidth assigned based on predefined constraints and implemented via algorithms (executable code) based predefined traffic constraints as associated with request/messages, explicit paths/nodes (col. 3, line 48 thru col. 4, line 7) utilizing registers for storage (col. 5, line 12-40, col. 7, line 36 thru col. 8, line 51, col. 9, line 1-25). However, Goguen is silent on attribute registers and operand pointers pointing to attribute registers. In a communication system that implements path determination via condition codes, Chernoff discloses communication between communication devices whereby condition codes (executable instructions) are utilized in a communication architecture that includes multiple registers used for storage of codes/instructions, (col. 16, line 40-65, col. 25, line 55-59), path determination as associated with executable code/instructions, pointers establishing connections between registers and plurality operands (first, second and third operand) (col. 63, line 1-18, col. 64, line 15-46), general purpose register reads and/or writes (Fig. 13, col. 20, line 37, col. 65, line 30-47), optimization execution depending on constraints (col. 60, line 50-62), second operand pointer points to parameter register, read only register (state container/parameter register) is utilized (col. 64, 16-45, col. 67, 6-10), server process via a path to determine from the server process whether there is a image corresponding to the routine of the application program wherein an execution has just been requested by a user (col. 9, line 61-65). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to be motivated to implement utilizing attribute registers in conjunction with operands pointers as taught by Chernoff with the teachings of Goguen for the purpose of further managing the conditional code and results as associated with determining paths in a traffic communication system.

3. Claims 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goguen et al in view of Chernoff et al as applied to claim 29 and 31 above, and further in view of Cao et al.

Regarding claim 32, as indicated above, Goguen and Chernoff disclose determining path in a communication system that utilizes constraint instruction as associated with request messaging. Both Goguen and Chernoff are silent on explicit node being either loose-hop or a strict-hop node. However, in a communication system that performs path determination Cao discloses (Abstract, Fig. 1, col. 5, line 10 thru col. 7, line 67, a communication system that employs explicit routing protocols between a plurality of LSR (label switched router), explicit routing is a subset of constraint-based routing, whereby explicit route is represented in a label-request message as a list or group of nodes, node selected from group of nodes, constraint-based route is encoded as a series of ER-hops which are loose hops, strict ER-hop, representation by a "Bad strict node." Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to be motivated to implement utilizing either a loose-hop node or strict-hop node as taught by Cao with the combined teachings of Goguen and Chernoff for the purpose of further establishing a path for traffic.

Allowable Subject Matter

1. Claims 18, 19, 36, 40, 41, 70 and 72 are allowed over prior art.
2. Claims 60 and 61 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

3. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Although the prior art discloses a communication system path determination by utilizing system constraints, they fail to teach or suggest to determine whether the node is a tail-end, head-end or intermediate node, if it is determined that the node is a tail-end node, and at least one network path determination constraint has been satisfied, then signaling back to an upstream node of that path that the path is O.K., determining whether a strict-hop node is specified as a next node of an explicit path constraint, a loose-hop node is specified as a next node of an explicit path constraint or no node is specified as an explicit path constraint, if a strict-hop node is specified as a next node of an explicit path constraint, then applying each of the at least one network path determination constraint to an appropriate one of a link between the node and the strict-hop node, and the partial path defined, determine whether to delegate constraint processing to another device and if it has been determined that constraint processing has been delegated to another network element, forwarding the message carrying the at least one network path determination constraint to the other device, a table including a second entry representing an accumulated value for a second attribute of a node connected to the node and a third entry storing a result of a specified operation performed on one of the first entry and the second entry.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Prenell P. Jones whose telephone number is 571-272-3180. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chieh Fan can be reached on 571-272-3042. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2668

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Prenell P. Jones

October 20, 2005



**CHIEH M. FAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER**